

09/727,191

MS150809.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as having an insufficient antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claim 6 depends from claim 1, which recites "...a remote user accessing an application across a *stateless protocol*..." (emphasis added). Thus, applicants' representative respectfully submits that there is sufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 16, 21-22, 26-38, and 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 1-12, 16, 21-22, 26-38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Berstis *et al.* (U.S. 6,510,458) (hereinafter Berstis). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Berstis does not teach or suggest each and every limitation as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 22, 35, 36, and 38) recites a component for ...*caching data...comprising state and/or user specific information*. In general, conventional systems have difficulty tracking state and/or user information with regard to applications accessed via stateless protocols. The subject invention overcomes

09/727,191

MS150809.1

such obstacles via employing a user context object (UCO) created for each session associated with an application, wherein a globally unique identifier associated with the UCO is transmitted by the browser session to the application and can be returned to the browser in subsequent application responses. Hence, the UCO can cache and maintain state and/or context information pertinent to an application session, even though the application was remotely accessed via a stateless protocol.

Berstis does not teach such aspects. Rather, Berstis allows a user to set preference parameters that *filter web page contents from being stored in the cache*. (See Berstis, col. 18, ln. 5-7). Content filter preferences may take three possible forms: ratings filters, site filters, and content filters. (See Berstis, col. 18, ln. 57- col. 19, ln. 13). A ratings filter can be used to block or save data to the cache based on a predefined ratings system in relation to a URL. (See Berstis, col. 15 & col. 16; col. 18, ln. 41-42). Site filters are merely a list of web sites selected by the user which, when accessed by the browser, will inhibit the web sites from being cached. (See Berstis, col. 18, ln. 64-67). The content filter requires the user to select content or key word preferences that filter any web page containing the selected content from being cached. (See Berstis, col. 19, ln. 6-13). Thus, from the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Berstis does not suggest *caching state and/or user specific information*.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of independent claims 1, 22, 35, 36, and 38 (and claims 2-12, 16, 21, 26-34, 37, and 40 which depend therefrom) should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 13-15, 17-20, 23-25, 39 and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 13-15, 17-20, 23-25, 39 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis in view of Himmel *et al.* (US 6,453,342) (hereinafter Himmel). Claims 13-15, 17-20, 23-25, 39 and 41 depend from independent claims 1, 22, 35, 36, and 38. It is respectfully submitted that these rejections should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The combination of Berstis and Himmel does not teach or suggest all claim limitations as recited in the subject claims.

09/727,191

MS150809.1

Himmel teaches a method and apparatus for selective caching and cleaning of history pages of web browsers. Specifically, *web content is parsed* for an indication of how the page should be stored. (See Himmel, Abstract). The web content is then stored using the indication. (See Himmel, Abstract). However, Himmel is silent regarding *caching state and/or user specific information*, and thus, fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Berstis. Therefore, Berstis in view of Himmel does not make obvious the subject invention, and applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, in view of the above comments . A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 (Ref. No. MSFT p177us).

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731